



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/907,904	07/19/2001	Robert Y. Seward	10010879-1	9947

7590 03/26/2004  
HEWLETT-PACKARD COMPANY  
Intellectual Property Administration  
P.O. Box 272400  
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

BOOKER, KELVIN E

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2121

DATE MAILED: 03/26/2004

4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

SC

## Interview Summary

Application No.

09/907,904

Applicant(s)

SEWARD, ROBERT Y.

Examiner

Kelvin E Booker

Art Unit

2121

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kelvin E Booker.

(3) N/A.

(2) John Harrop.

(4) N/A.

Date of Interview: 24 March 2004.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Anderson et al., "Genetic Algorithms for Combinatorial Optimization: The Assembly Line Balancing Problem".

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: A general overview of the intended invention and proposed amendments were discussed, as well as how the claims differ from the cited art. Also addressed was the scope of the claims as disclosed with respect to the specification, and the relationship between step three [e.g., associating offspring] and step four [e.g., selecting second-generation solutions] of claim one. In particular, the relationship which governs the association and selection of second-generation solutions based upon rating or scoring attributes. Based on the discussion, the examiner will reconsider the proposed amendment and fully consider subsequent submissions.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

